



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR FATENTS FO. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1459 www.unpto.gov

APPLICATION NO. F		LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/511,931	09/511,931 02/24/2000		Takayuki Sugawara	9281-3561 5649		
757	7590	07/24/2003				
BRINKS H	OFER G	ILSON & LIONE	EXAMINER			
P.O. BOX 10 CHICAGO,				BAKER, STI	BAKER, STEPHEN M	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2133	12	
			•	DATE MAILED: 07/24/2003	' /	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		PL4					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/511,931	SUGAWARA ET AL.					
•	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Stephen M. Baker	2133					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 07 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.							
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]							
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>07 July 2003</u> . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
$2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	ecause:						
(a) Ithey raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) Methey are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se	reconsideration has been consideration Sheet.	dered but does NOT place the					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.</li> </ol>	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly					
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b) ould be rejected is provided belo	will be entered and an wor appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disappr	oved by the Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).						
10. ☐ Other:							
-							
	·	Stephen M. Baker Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2133					





Continuation of 2. NOTE: A 512-byte sector size limitation requires further consideration to address in the standing rejection.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The phrase "on-the-fly" in the context of disk ECC corrections is understood to mean more than "without user intervention", as it also specifies no added delay in comparison to the error-free case, hence it has no basis in Applicant's disclosure. Hogan's DVD sectors are apparently interleaved to a depth of three, hence Hogan shows three ECC blocks per sector, while Applicant's claims of course do not rule out correcting such an interleaved DVD sector. Hogan's host corrects blocks that couldn't be corrected by the hardware which uses the row-wise coding 403, and such further correction attempt by the host presumably would involve using the additional level of ECC provided in the column-wise coding 404 that covers multiple sectors. There are apparently 64 sectors (192/3 as shown in Hogan's Fig. 4) covered by the column-wise coding. Ando's teachings are considered to be merely non-essential background to the rejection that is based on Hogan's DVD format.